

### **REMARKS**

In the Office Action mailed July 1, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 18-35. By way of the foregoing amendments and the markings to show changes claims 18-20, 23-26, and 28-37 are pending; claims 21-22 and 27 are cancelled, claims 36-37 are new, and claims 18, 23, and 31-35 are currently amended. The foregoing amendments are taken in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicant would otherwise be entitled in view of the prior art.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112**

Examiner has rejected claim 32 as being indefinite. With the current amendment, Applicants contend that the rejection is now moot.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102**

Examiner has rejected claims 18, 21-23, and 25-31 as being anticipated by van der Geest (US 6,403,002). Given the present amendments, Applicants contend that van der Geest does not contain all the elements of the claimed invention. The new claims 36 and 37 find their basis in the current specification at least about paragraphs 0049+.

Further, by the present amendment, it does not follow that the amended claims have become so perfect in their description that no one could devise an equivalent. After amendment, as before, limitations in the ability to describe the present invention in language in the patent claims naturally prevent the Applicants from capturing every nuance of the invention or describing with complete precision the range of its novelty or every possible equivalent. See, Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., 62 USPQ2d 1705 (2002). Accordingly, the foregoing amendments are made specifically in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicants would otherwise be entitled.

### CONCLUSIONS

In view of Applicants' amendments and remarks, the Examiner's rejections are believed to be rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner pass the case to issue at the earliest convenience. Should the Examiner have any question or wish to further discuss this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (248) 292-2920.

If for some reason Applicant has not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent the abandonment of this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1097 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: OCT 3, 2008



---

Eric Kurtycz  
Registration No. 59,484  
DOBRUSIN & THENNISCH PC  
29 W. Lawrence Street  
Suite 210  
Pontiac, MI 48342  
(248) 292-2920

Customer No. 25215